UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED
2008 AUG 15 PM 4:11
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY: DEPUTY

This space for Clerk's Office File Stamp

TO: ☐ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Houston

FROM: K. Hammerly, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 8/12/2008

CASE NO.: 08cv883 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff Hennington

CASE TITLE: Hennington v. VA San Diego Healthcare System

DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Ex Parte Application to Request Oral Argument

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

✓	*Local Rule*	*Discrepancy*
☐	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
☐	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
☐	**5.4**	**Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.**
☐	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
☐	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
☐	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
☐	7.1	Missing table of contents
☐	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
☐	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
☐		Supplemental documents require court order
☐		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X		OTHER: Resubmitting document that was rejected in discrepancy docket #8

Any future request for oral argument must state what motion or application plaintiff wants oral argument for.

Date forwarded: 8/12/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.

☑ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☑ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Houston

Dated: 8/13/08

By: [signature]

cc: All Parties

Case Number,
08cv0883 JAH(LSP)

Ex-Parte

REJECTED

Application to Respectfully Request Oral ARGument on the Grounds of Illegal confinement 28 § 1826 and Conflict of Interist Federal Laws and the Addmission of Evidence

Alvin, Hennington

Alvin Hennington Jr.

Aug. 12 - 08

RECEIVED
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA